

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
SPARTANBURG DIVISION

Melvin Johnson,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	C.A. No. 7:05-2785-HMH-WMC
)	
vs.)	OPINION & ORDER
)	
USF Holland,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

This matter is before the court with the Report of United States Magistrate Judge William M. Catoe, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 of the District of South Carolina.¹ Melvin Johnson (“Johnson”), proceeding pro se, filed a complaint asserting claims of a hostile work environment, race discrimination, and retaliation pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, et seq. Magistrate Judge Catoe recommends granting USF Holland’s motion for summary judgment. Johnson filed objections to the Report. For the reasons below, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report and recommendation and dismisses Johnson’s complaint.

DISCUSSION OF THE LAW

Objections to the Report must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party’s right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the

¹ The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (West Supp. 2006).

recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Johnson filed objections to the Report. After review, however, the court finds that Johnson's objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the Magistrate Judge's Report, and merely restate his claims. Therefore, after a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and recommendation.

Therefore, it is

ORDERED that USF Holland's motion for summary judgment is granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
October 10, 2006

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.